

### Remarks

Claims 1-21 and 23-45 are currently pending and stand rejected. Claims 1, 14, 20, 26, 30, 37, 41, and 45 have been amended. Applicants assert that the claims are now in condition for allowance as set forth more fully below.

### Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 4, 20, 23, 30, 32, 33, 37, 38, 41, and 42 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being unpatentable over Hogan (US Pat 5,692,132) in view of Saliba (US Pat App 2001/0037315). Claims 2, 3, 5-19, 21, 24-29, 31, 34-36, 39, 40, and 43-45 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hogan in view of Saliba and further in view of various other references including Gregory (US Pat 6,490,567), Friesen (US Pat 6,636,863), Ronen (US Pat 5,905,736), and Bauer (US Pat 5,870,759).

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Each of the claims now includes recitations that a user ID and second data are received via input fields of a graphical user interface, that the first data is retrieved based on the user ID and displayed within the GUI. These claims also include recitations that the first data is for purposes of identifying the user while the second data is for purposes of electronic procurement authorization. Additionally, these claims include recitations that the first and second data values are stored from the display field and second input field of the graphical user interface to the second database. Thus, the graphical user interface consolidates the first and second data values prior to these values being saved to the second database concurrently and persistently.

As a representative example of the claims, claim 1 specifically recites receiving a user identifier of a user via a first input field of a graphical user interface, sending a query to a first database based at least in part on the user identifier, receiving a first data value from the first database, the first data value being associated with the user for purposes of identifying the user and being displayed via a display field of the graphical user interface, and prompting for and receiving a second data value from a data source via a second input field of the graphical user interface, the second data value being associated with the user for purposes of electronic procurement authorization, the data source being different from the first database. Claim 1 further recites storing from the display field and the

second input field of the graphical user interface the first data value and the second data value in a second database such that the first data value from the first database and the second data value from the data source are contained within the second database concurrently and persistently, the second database being different from the first database.

The cited references fail to disclose these recitations. Currently, the Office Action relies upon the Saliba reference to provide for storing the first data value and the second data value in a second database concurrently and persistently. However, Saliba does not overcome the shortcomings of Hogan relative to a graphical user interface receiving a user ID and displaying the first data value from the first database via a display field where the first data value identifies the user, receiving a second data value via a second input field where the second data value is authorization information for an electronic procurement system, and storing the first and second data value from the graphical user interface to the second database.

To the contrary, Saliba only discloses the email itself, for purposes of conveying information to the reader. The email does not include first and second input fields that allow information to be input into the email, such as the user ID within the first input field and the second data value within the second input field. Furthermore, the email displays that which is already within an information store and is not used for the purpose of receiving input from a first database and a second data source to then save the first data value and the second data value therefrom to the second database. Therefore, the independent claims are allowable over Hogan in combination with Saliba, as well as the other references, for at least these reasons.

Additionally, the first data value of the email of Saliba is said to be the previous balance for a customer while the second data value of the email of Saliba is said to be the current order items of the customer. Thus, the first data value of Saliba email is not for purposes of identifying the user and the second data value of the Saliba email is not for purposes of electronic procurement authorization. Therefore, the independent claims are allowable over Hogan in combination with Saliba, as well as the other references, for at least these additional reasons.

The dependent claims depend from allowable base claims and are also allowable over the cited combinations for at least the same reasons.


Conclusion

Applicants assert that the application including claims 1-21 and 23-45 is now in condition for allowance. Applicants request reconsideration in view of the amendments and remarks above and further request that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

No fees beyond are believed due beyond the fee for continued examination. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 14, 2005

  
Jeramie J. Keys  
Reg. No. 42,724

Withers & Keys, LLC  
P.O. Box 71355  
Marietta, Ga 30007-1355  
(404) 849.2093